

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the non-final Office Action mailed June 2, 2005. Claims 1-22 were examined in the Office Action. Claims 1-22 were rejected. Independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended to clarify claim scope. No claims have been canceled or added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and examination in view of the following remarks.

Substance of Interview Summary

A telephonic interview occurred between the undersigned, Murrell Blackburn and Examiner William Bashore on Friday, August 5, 2005. The interview covered the rejections to claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardo et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,247,032 issued June 2001 (hereinafter Bernardo).

The undersigned pointed out to the Examiner that Applicants' amended independent claim 1 recites (1) comparing a second Review Cycle Identification Number (RCID) associated with the reviewed document to a first RCID in the configuration file and (2) displaying a second set of author reviewing tools, including at least one tool that is separate and distinct from the first set of author reviewing tools, in response to a determination that the second RCID matches the first RCID. In contrast, Bernardo discloses automated routing of a customized website to authorized users based on a pre-assigned role of the user. Bernardo discloses the display of standard links to users based on their pre-assigned role. Regardless of the status of the web site or whether a user has previously read, viewed, or composed the web site, the standard links are displayed based on a user's pre-assigned role. (See Bernardo, column 18, lines 34-67).

Amended claim 1 recites the display of a set reviewing tools separate and distinct from other sets of reviewing tools based on whether a first RCID in the configuration file matches a second RCID associated with a document. Thus, the author of the document, as recited in amended claim 1, may view one set of displayed reviewing tools before sending a document to a reviewer and view another distinct set of displayed reviewing tools after receiving a reply from the reviewer. Therefore, Bernardo, which discloses the display of standard links to all authorized users regardless document status, does not teach or suggest Applicants' amended claim 1.

The Examiner indicated that the amendment would likely overcome Bernardo but he would need to conduct a new search. Specifically, the Examiner indicated that the arguments made by the undersigned have merit, however further examination and/or search is still required. This written response is thus, submitted in follow-up to the telephonic interview for consideration by the Examiner, as it is believed to have placed the application in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernardo. Applicants respectfully submit that Bernardo does not teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants' amended independent claims 1 and 10.

Claim 1

Applicants' amended claim 1 is drawn to a method for automating a document review cycle involving an author of an original document and a reviewer. The method comprises, among other features, (1) in response to the indication that the original document is to be sent to the reviewer: displaying a first set of author reviewing tools, associating a first Review Cycle Identification Number (RCID) with the original document, and storing the first RCID in a configuration file, (2) receiving a reply email from the reviewer to the author, the reply email associated with a reviewed document, (3) comparing a second RCID associated with the reviewed document to the first RCID in the configuration file, and (4) displaying a second set of author reviewing tools, including at least one tool that is separate and distinct from the first set of author reviewing tools, in response to a determination that the second RCID matches the first RCID.

In contrast, Bernardo discloses automated routing of a customized website to authorized users based on a pre-assigned role of the user. Bernardo describes the display of standard links to users based on their pre-assigned role. Regardless of the status of the web site or whether a user has previously read, viewed, or composed the web site, the standard links are displayed based on a user's pre-assigned role. (See Bernardo, column 18, lines 34-67 and column 19, lines 14-16 and lines 45-50). Although Bernardo discloses automatic status messages, setting time limits for approval, routing order, and approval privileges for specific content on a Web page, none of these features teach or suggest the display of a variety of reviewing tools based on an

RCID comparison as recited in amended claim 1. (See Bernardo column 10, lines 64-67 and column 11, lines 1-5).

Amended claim 1 recites the display of a set reviewing tools separate and distinct from other sets of reviewing tools based on whether a first RCID in the configuration file matches a second RCID associated with a document. Thus, the author of the document, as recited in amended claim 1, may view one set of displayed reviewing tools before sending a document to a reviewer and view another distinct set of displayed reviewing tools after receiving a reply from the reviewer. Therefore, Bernardo, which discloses the display of standard links to all authorized users regardless document status, does not teach or suggest Applicants' amended claim 1, which is thus, allowable over Bernardo.

Claim 10

Applicants' amended claim 10 is drawn to a method for automating a review cycle involving an author of an original document and a reviewer. The method comprises, among other features, (1) determining whether the email note was received by the author or by the reviewer, (2) in response to a determination that the email note was received by the author, displaying a set of author reviewing tools, and (3) in response to a determination that the email note was received by the reviewer, displaying a set of reviewer reviewing tools wherein the set of author reviewing tools includes at least one tool that is separate and distinct from the set of reviewer reviewing tools.

In contrast, Bernardo discloses alerting authorized users by email that approval is needed when automatic notification is specified. This email contains a link to the page requiring approval. Each notification includes the same link without regard to whether the approver authored or just reviewed the document. (See Bernardo, column 20, lines 1-20). Thus, Bernardo does not teach or suggest determining whether the email was received by the author or reviewer and based on that determination displaying at least one of a variety of reviewing tools as recited in amended claim 10. Bernardo describes sending the same link to all approvers without distinction in display. Thus, amended claim 10 is also allowable over Bernardo.

Dependent Claims

At least because claims 2-9 and 11-22 inherit the language of amended claims 1 and 10 respectively, claims 2-9 and 11-22 are also allowable over Bernardo.


CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5100

Date: August 18, 2005


Murrell W. Blackburn
Reg. No. 50,881

